Towards a measurement of the two-photon decay width of the Standard Model Higgs boson at a Photon Collider

K. Mönig^{1,a}, A. Rosca²

¹DESY, 15738 Zeuthen, Germany

²West University of Timisoara, 300223 Timisoara, Romania

Received: 19 May 2008 / Revised: 29 July 2008 / Published online: 21 October 2008

© Springer-Verlag / Società Italiana di Fisica 2008

Abstract A study of the measurement of the two photon decay width times the branching ratio of the Standard Model Higgs boson with a mass of 120 GeV in photon–photon collisions is presented, assuming a $\gamma\gamma$ integrated luminosity of 80 fb^{-1} in the high energy part of the spectrum. The analysis is based on the reconstruction of the Higgs events produced in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow H$ process, followed by the decay of the Higgs into a $b\bar{b}$ pair. A statistical error of the measurement of the two-photon width, $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$, times the branching ratio of the Higgs boson, $\text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$ is found to be 2.1% for one year of data taking.

1 Introduction

The central challenge for particle physics nowadays is the origin of mass. In the Standard Model the masses of both fermions and gauge boson are generated through interactions with the same scalar field which gives rise to the Higgs boson H . While it can only be produced in association with other particles at an e^+e^- collider, the Higgs boson can be produced singly in the s -channel of the colliding photons at a Photon Collider. If it exists, the Higgs boson will certainly be discovered by the time such a facility will be constructed. The Photon Collider as an upgrade option at the ILC [1] will then permit a high precision measurement of the $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ partial width, which is a quantity sensitive to the existence of new charged particles. For this reason such a measurement is significantly important. If we find a deviation of the two photon width from the Standard Model prediction it means that an additional contribution from unknown particles is present, and so it is a signature of physics beyond the Standard Model. For example, the minimal extension of the Standard Model predicts the ratio of the two photon width $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, \text{MSSM})/\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, \text{SM}) < 1.2$

[2] for a Higgs boson with a mass of 120 GeV,¹ assuming a Supersymmetry scale of 1 TeV and the chargino mass parameters M and μ of 300 and 100 GeV, respectively.

At a Photon Collider one can measure the product $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \times \text{BR}(H \rightarrow X)$. To obtain the two-photon partial width independent of the branching ratio one has to combine the above measurement with an accurate measurement of the $\text{BR}(H \rightarrow X)$ from another machine.

This study investigates the capability of an ILC detector to measure the two photon decay width times the branching ratio for a Standard Model Higgs boson with the mass of 120 GeV, the preferred mass region by recent electroweak data [3]. The simulation of the signal and background processes is described in Sect. 2. Event selection is described in Sect. 3. Results are summarised in Sect. 4.

The feasibility of the measurement of the two photon decay width of the Standard Model Higgs boson in this mass region has also been reported in [4–7]. In the previous studies however, the background events were generated using a tree level matrix element program in which the NLO corrections of Jikia and Tkabladze [8–11] had been implemented, while the PS algorithm was not considered for the $q\bar{q}$ background production. Lund string fragmentation model was used afterwards for the next stages. It is known from LEP that this procedure is not able to get the fragmentation properties right, which is important for an accurate b -tagging [12]. In our simulation study we used a recently available generator SHERPA [13], which takes care properly for matching the matrix elements with the PS, as described in Sect. 2. Our analysis presents for the first time a simulation of the background processes that takes the special gluon radiation pattern of the events produced with $J = 0$ into account.

^a e-mail: klaus.moenig@desy.de

¹ In this paper we use $\hbar = c = 1$.

2 Simulation of the signal and background processes

The cross section for the Higgs boson formation is given by a Breit-Wigner approximation

$$\sigma_{\gamma\gamma\rightarrow H} = 8\pi \frac{\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)\Gamma_{\text{tot}}}{(s_{\gamma\gamma} - M_H^2)^2 + M_H^2\Gamma_{\text{tot}}^2} (1 + \lambda_1\lambda_2),$$

where M_H is the Higgs boson mass, $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ and Γ_{tot} are the two photon and total decay width of the Higgs boson, λ_1 and λ_2 are the initial photon helicities and $\sqrt{s_{\gamma\gamma}}$ is the $\gamma\gamma$ centre-of-mass energy. The initial photons should have equal helicities, so that $J_z = 0$, in order to make a spin-0 resonance as it is the case of the Higgs boson. If polarised photon beams are used, the signal cross section is increased up to a factor of 2. The experimentally observed cross section is obtained by folding this basic cross section with the $\gamma\gamma$ collider luminosity distribution.

For $M_H = 120$ GeV the Higgs decays dominantly into $b\bar{b}$. The event rate is thus given by:

$$N(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow H \rightarrow b\bar{b}) = \frac{d\mathcal{L}_{\gamma\gamma}}{d\sqrt{s_{\gamma\gamma}}} \bigg|_{M_H} \frac{4\pi^2 \Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})}{M_H^2} (1 + \lambda_1\lambda_2).$$

This rate depends strongly on the value of the differential luminosity at the Higgs mass, $\frac{d\mathcal{L}_{\gamma\gamma}}{d\sqrt{s_{\gamma\gamma}}} \big|_{M_H}$.

High energy photon beams can be produced at a high rate in Compton backscattering of laser photons off high energy electrons [14]. The beam spectra with $\sqrt{s_{ee}} = 210$ GeV are simulated using CompAZ [15], a fast parametrisation which includes multiple interactions and non-linear effects. The shape of the luminosity distribution depends on the electron and laser beam parameters. The electron and laser beam energy considered for this study are 105 GeV and 1 eV, respectively, resulting in a maximum photon energy of about 70 GeV, suitable to study a Higgs boson with a mass of 120 GeV. Setting opposite helicities for the laser photons and the beam electrons the energy spectrum of the backscattered photons is peaked at about 60% of the e^- beam energy. The number of high energy scattered photons is nearly two times larger if we use polarised photons and electrons with opposite helicities than in the case of unpolarised electrons and laser photons. Consequently, this leads to an improved luminosity in the high energy part of the spectrum. The scattered photons are highly polarised in this high energy region. The helicity combination of the two high energy photons can be arranged such that the $J_z = 0$ state is dominant. The resulting value of $\frac{d\mathcal{L}_{\gamma\gamma}}{d\sqrt{s_{\gamma\gamma}}} \big|_{M_H}$ is $1.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}/\text{GeV}$ in one year of running using the parameters from [14].

The branching ratios $\text{BR}(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$, $\text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$ and the total width are taken to be 0.22%, 68% and 4 MeV, respectively. These numbers are calculated with the HDECAY

[16] program and include QCD radiative corrections. With an integrated luminosity of 80 fb^{-1} per year in the hard part of the spectrum [14] about 20000 signal events can be produced under these conditions.

The signal $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ is simulated with PYTHIA [17, 18]. A total of 100K events were generated. Gluon emission and hadronisation are simulated using the parton shower and string fragmentation models of PYTHIA.

The main background processes to an intermediate mass Standard Model Higgs production are the direct continuum $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ production. The light quarks are very efficiently rejected by the b-tagging. Due to helicity conservation, the continuum background production proceeds mainly through states of opposite photon helicities, i.e. $J_z = 2$. Choosing equal helicity photon polarisations the cross section of the continuum background on Born level is suppressed by a factor $M_q^2/s_{\gamma\gamma}$, with M_q being the quark mass. Unfortunately, this suppression does not apply to the process $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$, because after gluon radiation the $q\bar{q}$ system is not necessarily in a $J_z = 0$ state. The resulting background is still very large compared to the signal. Therefore, a reliable prediction of the background implies to consider NLO QCD corrections. Exact one-loop QCD corrections have been calculated in [8] for both $J_z = 0$ and $J_z = 2$ states and most recently in [9]. For the $J_z = 0$ state it has been found that double logarithmic corrections are also necessary and these were calculated and resummed to all orders in the form of a non-Sudakov form factor in [10, 11]. For the background studies the SHERPA [13] generator has been used. SHERPA is a tree level matrix element generator which uses the CKKW [19] method to merge the matrix elements for parton production with the parton shower. Using a jet algorithm, the kinematic range for n partons is partitioned into two regions, a region of jet production which is covered by the corresponding matrix elements, and a region of jet evolution which is covered by the parton shower. In the matrix element dominated region the hard kinematics is that of n partons while in the parton shower dominated region the hard kinematics is that relevant to $n - 1$ partons. In both regions, the matrix elements are reweighted with a combination of Sudakov form factors entering the shower algorithm. The hard emissions in the parton shower leading to a jet are vetoed, preventing the shower to populate this region. At the end, the physical observables will exhibit a dependence on the jet resolution parameter, y_{cut} , of the next-to-next-to-leading log nature, i.e. $\alpha_s^k \log^{2k-2} y_{\text{cut}}$. We generated $q\bar{q}$ and $q\bar{q}g$ events using a value for the jet resolution parameter of 0.0001 [20]. For higher y_{cut} large discontinuities around the cut value have been observed in the $2 \rightarrow 3$ jet rate distribution as a function of y_{23} . The reason of their presence is that SHERPA, being a tree level generator, cannot simulate $q\bar{q}g$ events where one quark has very low energy or the two quarks are very collinear, so

Fig. 1 Scaled SHERPA cross sections for $J_z = 0$ compared to the NLO calculations for (a) $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow b\bar{b}(g)$ and (b) $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow c\bar{c}(g)$

that those events would effectively be two-jet events at the given cutoff. Such three jet $q\bar{q}g$ events, with a highly energetic gluon and the other two quarks collinear, are largely produced in the $J_z = 0$ state since the M_q^2/s suppression is replaced by an α_s/π term in the cross section. Finally, the total cross sections given by SHERPA for the $b\bar{b}(g)$ and $c\bar{c}(g)$ processes for the $J_z = 0$ state were scaled by a factor of 1.34 and 1.92 respectively, as one can see in Fig. 1. These K-factors resulted from a comparison between the SHERPA cross sections and the theoretical NLO calculations.

Processes with a partonic content of the photon were not included in the simulation of the backgrounds. Such processes have been studied by earlier analysis and found to be strongly suppressed, see for instance [21] and [7].

A total of 1000K events were generated for each background process and each $\gamma\gamma$ spin state.

A convolution with the luminosity distribution is performed and a kinematic cut of $\sqrt{s}_{\gamma\gamma} > 80$ GeV is imposed during the event generation for both signal and background processes.

The response of the detector has been simulated with SIMDET4 [22], a parametric Monte Carlo for the TESLA e^+e^- detector. It includes a tracking and calorimeter simulation and a reconstruction of energy-flow-objects (EFO). Only EFOs with a polar angle above 7° have been taken for the Higgs reconstruction simulating the acceptance of the photon collider detector as the only deference to the e^+e^- detector [23].

The cross-section for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ events, within the energy range above 2 GeV, is several hundred nb [24], so that about 1.0 event of this type is produced per bunch crossing. These events (pile-up) are overlaid to the signal events. Since the pile-up events are produced in the t-channel q-exchange most of the resulting final state particles are distributed at low angles.

3 Event selection

An intermediate mass Higgs production mainly leads to the final state: $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$. The major characteristics of these events, used to distinguish the signal from the background, are the event topology and the richness in b quarks. The background consists of multi-jet events coming from $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow q\bar{q}(g)$ processes.

In order to minimise the pile-up contribution to the high energy signal tracks the first step in the separation procedure was to reject pile-up tracks as much as possible. The measurement of the impact parameter of a particle along the beam axis with respect to the primary vertex is used for this purpose, as described in Ref. [25]. A reconstruction of the angle of each EFO with respect to the z-axis, θ_{EFO} makes it possible to distinguish further between signal and pile-up EFOs. EFOs are rejected if $|\cos(\theta_{\text{EFO}})| > 0.950$.

Balanced hadronic events are then selected requiring a large particle multiplicity (at least 5 EFO), a large visible energy ($E_{\text{visible}} > 95$ GeV) and a small longitudinal imbalance, normalised to the visible energy (not larger than 0.1). Figure 2 shows the distributions of the visible energy and the longitudinal imbalance.

Due to the fact that the Higgs is centrally produced, the requirement that the thrust of the event, see Fig. 3 left, points in the central region of the detector ($|\cos\theta_{\text{thrust}}| \leq 0.7$) allows to reduce further the background while keeping a large fraction of the signal.

In the remaining event sample jets are reconstructed using the DURHAM clustering scheme [26] with a resolution parameter $y_{\text{cut}} = 0.02$. Events are kept only if there are at least 2 such jets.

The cross section for the continuum production of the charm quark is 16 times larger than for bottom quarks. Therefore one of the most critical issues for this analysis is the capability of the detector to identify events in which

Fig. 2 *Left*: distributions of the visible energy and *right*: of the longitudinal imbalance for signal ($M_H = 120$ GeV) and background. The distribution for the signal is arbitrarily normalised

Fig. 3 *Left*: distribution of the absolute value of the cosine of the thrust angle for signal ($M_H = 120$ GeV) and background. The distribution for signal is arbitrarily normalised. *Right*: Efficiency on b quarks and b-purity of the b-tagging for simulated $q\bar{q}$ events at $\sqrt{s} = M_Z$

a b quark is produced. For this aim a b-tagging algorithm based on a Neural Network has been applied. The algorithm combines several discriminating variables, as for example, the impact parameter joint probability introduced by ALEPH [27] and the p_T corrected vertex invariant mass obtained with the ZVTOP algorithm written for the SLD experiment [28] into a feed forward Neural Network with 12 inputs and 3 output nodes, described in Ref. [29].

Figure 3 right shows the efficiency to tag b-quarks and the b-quark purity for the algorithm exploited. It has been obtained on a Monte Carlo sample of $q\bar{q}$ events at $\sqrt{s} = M_Z$. The b-tagging efficiency corresponding to a purity of 97% is 50%.

The b-quarks coming from the decay of the Higgs boson are highly energetic, whereas in the case of the $J = 0$ background normally the gluon and one b-quark jet are the most energetic. This is shown for 3-jet events in Fig. 4. In order to

reduce the background further we look at the two fastest jets in the event and require the NN_{out} to be greater than 0.9 for one jet and greater than 0.1 for the second one. This procedure is also efficient for 2-jet events. There is a large number of 2-jet background events where one b is low energetic or both b-quarks are collinear so that they get merged into one jet. For this reason 40% of the $J = 0$ 2-jet events are rejected by the b-tagging cut on the second jet while only 15% of the signal events fail this cut.

The total signal efficiency is estimated to be 22% in the presence of the pile-up events.

4 Results

The reconstructed invariant mass for the selected signal and background events is shown in Fig. 5. Here the invariant

Fig. 4 Distributions of the b-quarks and gluon jets for the background (left) and the signal (right)

Fig. 5 Higgs invariant mass reconstruction on signal and background for a Higgs mass of 120 GeV without (left) and with (right) pile-up events overlaid

mass is corrected for escaping neutrinos as in Ref. [6]. To enhance the signal a cut on the invariant mass is tuned such that the statistical significance of the signal over background is maximised. Events in the mass region of $112 \text{ GeV} < M_{\text{jets}} < 134 \text{ GeV}$ are selected. The number of estimated signal and background events in this window are 3534 and 2170, respectively. Because of the specific b-tagging cut the efficiency for the $J = 0$ b-background is around 30% smaller than for $J = 2$, so that one of the largest background are $J = 2$ b-events which might actually be reduced if a larger beam polarisation is possible. The other large background are c-events with $J = 0$. For charm the b-tagging efficiency apparently gets enhanced if both c-quarks are boosted into the same jet. This background may be reduced with a b-tagging procedure especially adapted to this analysis.

The two photon decay width of the Higgs boson is proportional to the event rates of the Higgs signal. The statistical error of the number of signal events, $\sqrt{N_{\text{obs}}}/(N_{\text{obs}} -$

$N_{\text{bkg}})$, corresponds to the statistical error of this measurement. Here N_{obs} is the number of observed events, while N_{bkg} is the number of expected background events.

We obtain

$$\frac{\Delta[\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \times \text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})]}{[\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \times \text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})]} = \sqrt{N_{\text{obs}}}/(N_{\text{obs}} - N_{\text{bkg}}) = 2.1\%.$$

5 Conclusions

The photon collider option at the ILC offers the possibility to measure the partial width of the Higgs into photons, $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$. Taking higher order QCD corrections for the background into account and using realistic assumptions for the detector and background from pileup events we conclude that for a Higgs boson with a mass $M_H = 120 \text{ GeV}$

$\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \times \text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$ can be measured to 2.1%. Using $\Delta\text{BR}(H \rightarrow b\bar{b}) = 2\text{--}3\%$ from the e^+e^- mode of the ILC [30] the photonic width of the Higgs can be determined to 3%. At this accuracy one can distinguish between the Standard Model Higgs particle and the lightest scalar Higgs boson predicted by models beyond the Standard Model. Also, the precise measurement of the decay width $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ can reveal heavy charged particles circulating in the loop, as for example supersymmetric particles. The accuracy of the mass determination of the heavier stop $\tilde{t}_2$ is estimated to be 10–20 GeV in [31], assuming that the lighter stop $\tilde{t}_1$ and the mixing angle $\theta_{\tilde{t}}$ are known.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Georgi Jikia, Frank Krauss and Andreas Schälicke for many interesting discussions. Part of this work was supported by the CEEX Program of the Romanian Ministry of Education, Research and Youth, contracts 05-D11-81/21.10.2005 and 3176/12.10.2005.

References

- Parameters for the Linear Collider. http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/icfa/LC_parameters.pdf
- D.L. Borden, D.A. Bauer, D.O. Caldwell, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4018 (1993)
- The ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL Collaborations and the LEP Electroweak Working Group, CERN-PH-EP/2006-042. hep-ex/0612034
- T. Ohgaki, T. Takahashi, I. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 1723–1729 (1997)
- G. Jikia, S. Söldner-Rembold, Nucl. Instrum. Methods A **472**, 133 (2001)
- P. Niezurawski, A.F. Zarnecki, M. Krawczyk, Acta Phys. Pol. B **34**, 177 (2003)
- P. Niezurawski, PhD thesis. hep-ph/0503295
- G. Jikia, A. Tkabladze, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 2030 (1996)
- V.A. Khoze, M.G. Ryskin, W.J. Stirling, Eur. Phys. J. C **48**, 797 (2006). hep-ph/0607134
- M. Melles, W.J. Stirling, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 94009 (1999)
- M. Melles, W.J. Stirling, Eur. Phys. J. C **9**, 101 (1999)
- P.A. Aarnio et al. (Delphi Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **240**, 271 (1990)
- T. Gleisberg, S. Hoche, F. Krauss, A. Schalick, S. Schumann, J.C. Winter, J. High Energy Phys. **0402**, 056 (2004). hep-ph/0311263
- B. Badelek et al., DESY-01-011
- A.F. Zarnecki, Acta Phys. Pol. B **34**, 2741 (2003)
- A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski, M. Spira, Comput. Phys. Commun. **108**, 56 (1998)
- T. Sjöstrand, CERN-TH/7112/93 (1993), revised August 1995
- T. Sjöstrand, Comput. Phys. Commun. **82**, 74 (1994)
- S. Catani, F. Krauss, R. Kuhn, B.R. Webber, J. High Energy Phys. **0111**, 063 (2001)
- K. Mönig, A. Rosca, Acta Phys. Pol. B **37**, 1181 (2006)
- A.F. Zarnecki, in *The 2nd ECFA/DESY Workshop*, St. Malo, 12–15 April 2002
- M. Pohl, H.J. Schreiber, DESY-02-061
- F. Bechtel et al., Nucl. Instrum. Methods A **564**, 243 (2006)
- The Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara et al., Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002)
- K. Mönig, I. Sekaric, Eur. Phys. J. C **38**, 427 (2005)
- S. Bethke et al., Nucl. Phys. B **370**, 310 (1992)
- D. Buskulic et al. (ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **313**, 535 (1993)
- D.J. Jackson, Nucl. Instrum. Methods A **388**, 247 (1997)
- R. Hawkins, LC-PHSM-2000-021
- J.A. Aguilar-Saavedra et al., DESY-01-011c. hep-ph/0106315
- D. Asner et al., hep-ph/0208219